arXiv:1512.07284v1 [math.PR] 22 Dec 2015

Exact sampling for some multi-dimensional queueing models with renewal input

Jose Blanchet * Yanan Pei * Karl Sigman *

December 24, 2015

Abstract

Using a recent result of Blanchet and Wallwater ([6]) for exactly simulating the maximum of a negative drift random walk queue endowed with iid increments, we extend it to a multidmensional setting and then we give a new algorithm for simulating exactly the stationary distribution of a stable FIFO $GI/GI/c$ queue, $2 \leq c < \infty$, as well as dealing with (for the first time) some other models. Our method for the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ queue utilizes dominated coupling from the past (DCFP) as well as the Random Assignment (RA) discipline, and compliments the earlier work of Sigman ([13], [14]) in which Poisson arrivals were assumed, as well as the recent work of Connor and Kendall ([7]) who extended the DCFP method and time reversibility used in [13] to allow for $\rho < c$ by also using the RA model. It also contrasts with the recent method used in Blanchet, Dong and Pei ([5]) in which a vacation model was used as an upper bound. We also consider the models in continuous-time and show that with mild further assumptions, the exact simulation of those stationary distributions can also be achieved. In addition we show how to handle models with different service disciplines, such as LIFO and "randomly choose next". We also give, using our FIFO algorithm, a new exact simulation algorithm for the stationary distribution of the $GI/GI/\infty$ model. Finally, we even show how to handle Fork-Join queues.

Keywords EXACT SAMPLING; MULTI-SERVER QUEUE, RANDOM WALKS, RANDOM ASSIGNMENT; DOMINATED COUPLING FROM THE PAST.

AMS Subject Classification: 65C05; 90B22; 60K25;60J05;60K05;68U20.

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

1 Introduction

The first algorithms yielding exact simulation in stationarity of the FIFO multi-server queue are [13], and [14], in which Poisson arrivals are assumed; e.g., the $M/G/c$ case. In [13], a *dominated coupling from the past* (DCFP) method is used, but the strong condition of super stability is assumed, $\rho < 1$, instead of $\rho < c$. As a dominating process, the $M/G/1$ queue is used under Processor Sharing (PS) together (key) with its time-reversibility properties. Then in [14], the general $\rho < c$ case is covered by using a forward time regenerative method and using the $M/G/c$ model under a random assignment (RA) discipline as an upper bound. Then in [7], Connor and Kendall generalize the DCFP/PS method in [13] by using the RA model. They accomplish this by first exactly simulating the RA model in stationarity backwards in time under PS at each node, then re-constructing it to obtain the RA model with FIFO at each node and doing so in such a way that a sample-path upper bound for the FIFO $M/G/c$ is achieved. (DCFP methods evolved from Coupling From the Past (CFP) methods as introduced in Propp and Wilson [12] for finite-state discrete-time Markov chains.)

As for renewal arrivals, the various methods used above break down for various reasons, primarily because while under Poisson arrivals the c stations under RA become independent, they are not independent for general renewal arrivals. Also, the time-reversibility property of PS no longer holds, nor does Poisson Arrivals See Time Averages (PASTA). Finally, under general renewal arrivals, the system may never empty once it begins operating. New methods are needed. Blanchet, Dong and Pei ([5]) solve the problem by utilizing a vacation model as an upper bound. In the present paper, however, we utilize DCFP by directly simulating the RA model in reverse-time (under FIFO at each node). Our approach leads to many new results for other models too, such as multi-server queues under LIFO, or "randomly choose next", and even Fork-Join models.

2 The FIFO $GI/GI/c$ model

In what follows, as input to a c-server in parallel multi-server queue, we have iid service times $\{S_n\}$ distributed as $G(x) = P(S \leq x),\ x \geq 0$, with finite and non-zero mean $0 < E(S) = 1/\mu < \infty$. Independently, the arrival times $\{t_n : n \geq 0\}$ $(t_0 = 0)$ to the model form a renewal process with iid interarrival times $T_n = t_{n+1} - t_n,\ n \geq 0$ distributed as $A(x) = P(T \leq x),\ x \geq 0$, and finite non-zero arrival rate $0 < \lambda = E(T)^{-1} < \infty$. The FIFO $GI/GI/c$ model has only one queue (line), let $\mathbf{W}_n = (W_n(1), \ldots, W_n(c))$ denote the *Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector* (see for example, Page 341 in Chapter 12 of [1]). It satisfies the recursion

$$\mathbf{W}_{n+1} = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{W}_n + S_n\mathbf{e} - T_n\mathbf{f})^+,\ n \geq 0, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{e} = (1, 0, \ldots 0)^T$, $\mathbf{f} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$, $\mathcal{R}$ places a vector in ascending order, and $^+$ takes the positive part of each coordinate. $D_n = W_n(1)$ is then customer delay in queue (line) of the n^{th} customer. Recursion (1) defines a Markov chain due to the given iid assumptions.

With $\rho < c$ (stability), it is well known that $\mathbf{W}_n$ converges in distribution as $n \to \infty$ to a proper stationary distribution. Let π denote this stationary distribution. Our main objective in the present paper is to provide a simulation algorithm for sampling exactly from π.

3 The RA $GI/GI/c$ model

Given a c-server queueing model, the random assignment model (RA) is the case when each of the c servers forms its own FIFO single-server queue, and each arrival to the system, independent

of the past, randomly chooses queue i to join with probability $1/c,\ i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, c\}$. In the $GI/GI/c$ case, we refer to this as the RA $GI/GI/c$ model. The following is a special case of Lemma 1.3, Page 342 in [1]. (Such results and others even more general are based on [17], [10], and [11].)

Lemma 3.1 *Let $Q_F(t)$ denote total number of customers in system at time $t \geq 0$ for the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ model, and let $Q_{RA}(t)$ denote total number of customers in system at time $t \geq 0$ for the corresponding RA $GI/GI/c$ model in which both models are initially empty and fed with exactly the same input of renewal arrivals $\{t_n\}$ and iid service times $\{S_n\}$. Assume further that for both models the service times are used by the servers in the order in which service initiations occur (S_n is the service time used for the n^{th} such initiation). Then*

$$P(Q_F(t) \leq Q_{RA}(t),\ \textit{for all } t \geq 0) = 1. \tag{2}$$

The importance of Lemma 3.1 is that it allows us to jointly simulate versions of the two stochastic processes $\{Q_F(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{Q_{RA}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ while achieving a coupling such that (2) holds. In particular, whenever an arrival finds the RA model empty, the FIFO model is found empty as well. (But we need to impose further conditions if we wish to ensure that indeed the RA GI/GI/c will empty with certainty.) Letting time t be sampled at arrival times of customers, $\{t_n : n \geq 0\}$, we thus also have

$$P(Q_F(t_n-) \leq Q_{RA}(t_n-),\ \text{for all } n \geq 0) = 1. \tag{3}$$

In other words, the total number in system as found by the n^{th} arrival is sample-path ordered also. Note that for the FIFO model, the n^{th} arriving customer, denoted by C_n, initiates the n^{th} service since FIFO means "First-In-Queue-First-Out-of-Queue" where by "queue" we mean the line before entering service. This means that for the FIFO model we can attach S_n to C_n upon arrival if we so wish when applying Lemma 3.1. For the RA model, however, customers are not served in the order they arrive. For example consider $c = 2$ servers (system initially empty) and suppose C_1 is assigned to node 1 with service time S_1, and C_2 also is assigned to node 1 (before C_1 departs) with service time S_2. Meanwhile, before C_1 departs, suppose C_3 arrives and is assigned to the empty node 2 with service time S_3. Then S_3 is used for the second service initiation. *For RA, the service times in order of initiation are a random permutation of the originally assigned $\{S_n\}$.*

To use Lemma 3.1 it is crucial to simply let the server hand out service times one at a time when they are needed for a service initiation. Thus, customers waiting in a queue before starting service do not have a service time assigned until they enter service. In simulation terminology, this amounts to generating the service times in order of when they are needed.

One disadvantage of generating service times only when they are needed, is that it then does not allow workload[1] to be defined; only the amount of work in service. To get around this if need be, one can simply generate service times upon arrival of customers, and give them to the server to be used in order of service initiation. The point is that when C_n arrives, the total work in system jumps up by the amount S_n. But S_n is not assigned to C_n, it is assigned (perhaps later) to which ever customer initiates the n^{th} service. This allows Lemma 3.1 to hold true for total amount of work in the systems: If we let $\{V_F(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{V_{RA}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ denote total workload in the two models with the service times used in the manner just explained, then in addition to Lemma 3.1 we have

$$P(V_F(t) \leq V_{RA}(t),\ \text{for all } t \geq 0) = 1, \tag{4}$$

[1]Workload (total) at any time t is defined as the sum of all whole and remaining service times in the system at time t.

$$P(V_F(t_n-) \le V_{RA}(t_n-), \text{ for all } n \ge 0) = 1. \quad (5)$$

It is important, however, to note that what one can't do is define workload at the individual nodes i by doing this, because that forces us to assign S_n to C_n so that workload at the node that C_n attends (i say) jumps by S_n and C_n enters service using S_n; that destroys the proper coupling needed to obtain Lemma 3.1. We can only handle the total (sum over all c nodes) workload. In the present paper, our use of Lemma 3.1 is via a kind of reversal:

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\{S'_n\}$ be an iid sequence of service times distributed as G, and assign S'_n to C_n in the RA model. Define S_n as the service time used in the n^{th} service initiation. Then $\{S_n\}$ is also iid distributed as G.*

The point of the above Lemma 3.2 is that we can, if we so wish, simulate the RA model by assigning S'_n to C_n (to be used as their service time), but then assigning S_n to C_n in the FIFO model. By doing so the requirements of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied and (2), (3), (4) and (5) hold. Interestingly, however, it is not possible to first simulate the RA model up to a fixed time t, and then stop and reconstruct the FIFO model up to this time t: At time t, there may still be RA customers waiting in lines and hence not enough of the S_n have been determined yet to construct the FIFO model. But all we have to do, if need be, is to continue the simulation of the RA model beyond t until enough S_n have been determined to construct fully the FIFO model up to t.

4 Simulating exactly from the stationary distribution of the RA $GI/GI/c$ model

Letting $\mathbf{V}_n = (V_n(1), \ldots, V_n(c))$ denote workload (at each node) as found by the n^{th} arriving customer to the RA model, from the exogenous renewal process with arrival times $\{t_n\}$ and iid interarrival times $T_n = t_{n+1} - t_n,\ n \ge 0$ ($t_0 = 0$), and letting $S_n(i) = S_n I\{U_n = i\}$, where independently $\{U_n : n \ge 0\}$ denotes an iid sequence of random variables with the discrete uniform distribution over $\{1, 2, \ldots, c\}$, ($I\{B\}$ is the indicator random variable for the event B), we have, for each node $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, c\}$,

$$V_{n+1}(i) = (V_n(i) + S_n(i) - T_n)^+,\ n \ge 0. \quad (6)$$

These c processes are dependent through the common arrival times $\{t_n\}$ (equivalently common interarrival times T_n) and the common $\{U_n\}$ random variables. But because of all the iid assumptions, $\{\mathbf{V}_n\}$ forms a Markov chain. By defining $\mathbf{S}_n = (S_n(1), ..., S_n(c))$, and $\mathbf{T}_n = (T_n, T_n, \ldots, T_n)$ (length c vector) we can express (6) in vector form as follows:

$$\mathbf{V}_{n+1} = (\mathbf{V}_n + \mathbf{S}_n - \mathbf{T}_n)^+,\ n \ge 0. \quad (7)$$

Each node i as expressed in (6) can be viewed as a FIFO $GI/GI/1$ queue with the same common renewal arrival process $\{t_n\}$, but with iid service times $\{S_n(i)\}$. Across i, the service times $(S_n(1), \ldots, S_n(c))$ are not independent, but they are identically distributed: marginally, with probability $1/c$, $S_n(i)$ is distributed as G, and with probability $(c-1)/c$ it is distributed as the point mass at 0; $E(S(i)) = E(S)/c$. The point here is that we are not treating node i as a single-server queue endowed only with its own arrivals (a thinning of the $\{t_n\}$), and its own service times iid distributed as G. Defining iid increments $\Delta_n(i) = S_n(i) - T_n,\ n \ge 0$, each node i has an associated negative drift random walk $\{R_n(i) : n \ge 0\}$ with $R_0(i) = 0$ and

$$R_n(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta_j(i),\ n \ge 1. \quad (8)$$

With $\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda E(S) < c$, we note that $\rho_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda E(S(i)) = \lambda E(S)/c = \rho/c < 1$; equivalently $E(\Delta(i)) < 0$. Letting $V^0(i)$ denote a random variable with the limiting (stationary) distribution of $V_n(i)$ as $n \to \infty$, it is well known (due to the iid assumptions) that $V^0(i)$ has the same distribution as

$$M(i) = \max_{m \geq 0} R_m(i).$$

More generally, even when the increment sequence is just stationary ergodic, not necessarily iid (hence not time reversible as in the iid case), it is the backwards in time maximum that is used in constructing a stationary version of $\{V_n(i)\}$. We will need this backwards approach in our simulation so we go over it here; it is usually referred to as *Loynes' Lemma*. The sequences $\{S_n\},\ \{U_n\},\ \{T_n\},\ n \geq 0$, are extended to be two-sided iid; $-\infty < n < +\infty$, thus allowing two-sided iid increment sequences $\{\Delta_n(i) : -\infty < n < +\infty\}$. Then the c time-reversed (increments) random walks are defined by $R_0^{(r)}(i) = 0$ and

$$R_n^{(r)}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta_{-j}(i),\ n \geq 1.\ (1 \leq i \leq c) \tag{9}$$

A (from the infinite past) stationary version of $\{V_n(i)\}$ denoted by $\{V_n^0(i) : n \leq 0\}$ is then constructed via

$$\begin{aligned}
V_0^0(i) &= \max_{m \geq 0} R_m^{(r)}(i) && (10)\\
V_{-1}^0(i) &= \max_{m \geq 1} R_m^{(r)}(i) - R_1^{(r)}(i) && (11)\\
V_{-2}^0(i) &= \max_{m \geq 2} R_m^{(r)}(i) - R_2^{(r)}(i) && (12)\\
&\vdots && (13)\\
V_{-n}^0(i) &= \max_{m \geq n} R_m^{(r)}(i) - R_n^{(r)}(i) && (14)
\end{aligned}$$

By construction, the joint process $\mathbf{V}_n^0 = (V_n^0(1), \ldots, V_n^0(c)),\ n \leq 0$, is jointly stationary representing a (from the infinite past) stationary version of $\{\mathbf{V}_n\}$, and satisfies the forward-time recursion (7):

$$\mathbf{V}_{n+1}^0 = (\mathbf{V}_n^0 + \mathbf{S}_n - \mathbf{T}_n)^+,\ n \leq 0. \tag{15}$$

Thus, by starting at $n = 0$ and walking backwards in time, we have (theoretically) a time-reversed copy of the RA model. Furthermore, $\{\mathbf{V}_n^0\}$ can be extended to include forward time $n \geq 1$ via using the recursion further:

$$\mathbf{V}_n^0 = (\mathbf{V}_{n-1}^0 + \mathbf{S}_{n-1} - \mathbf{T}_{n-1})^+,\ n \geq 1. \tag{16}$$

In fact once we have a copy of just $\mathbf{V}_0^0$, we can start off the Markov chain with it as initial condition and use (16) to obtain a forward in time stationary version $\{\mathbf{V}_n^0 : n \geq 0\}$.

The above "construction", however, is theoretical, we do not yet have any explicit way of obtaining a copy of $\mathbf{V}_0^0$, let alone an entire infinite from-the-past sequence $\{\mathbf{V}_n^0 : n \leq 0\}$. In Blanchet and Wallwater [6], a simulation algorithm is given that yields (when applied to each of our random walks), for each $1 \leq i \leq c$, a copy of $\{(R_n^{(r)}(i), V_{-n}^0(i)) : 0 \leq n \leq N\}$ for any desired $0 \leq N < \infty$ including stopping times N. We modify the algorithm so that it can do the simulation jointly across the c systems, that is, we extend it to a multidimensional form.

In particular, it yields an algorithm for obtaining a copy of $\mathbf{V}_0^0$, as well as a finite segment (of length N) of a backwards in time copy of the RA model; $\{\mathbf{V}_{-n}^0 : 0 \leq n \leq N\}$, a stationary into the past construction up to time $-N$. What is required is that one can simulate both from the service time distribution G and the interarrival time distribution A, explicitly know their means and variances, and have an explicit density function $g(x)$ for G. Finite exponential moments are not required (because, only *truncated* exponential moments are needed $E(e^{\gamma\Delta(i)}I\{|\Delta(i)| \leq a\})$, which in turn allow for the simulation of the exponential tilting of truncated $\Delta(i)$, via acceptance-rejection). To get finite expected termination time (at one individual node) one needs moments slightly beyond 2: For some (explicitly known) $\epsilon > 0$, $E(S^{2+\epsilon}) < \infty$ and $E(T^{2+\epsilon}) < \infty$.

As our first case, we will be considering the stopping time N, defined as

$$N = \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathbf{V}_{-n}^0 = \mathbf{0}\}, \tag{17}$$

the first time walking in the past, that all coordinates are 0. To ensure that $P(N < \infty) = 1$, in addition to $\rho < c$ (stability), it is required that $P(T > S) > 0$, for which the most common sufficient conditions are that T has unbounded support, $P(T > t) > 0,\ t \geq 0$, or S has mass arbitrarily close to 0, $P(S < t) > 0,\ t > 0$. But as we shall show in Section 7, given we know that $P(T > S) > 0$, we can assume without loss of generality that interarrival times are bounded. It is that assumption which makes the extension of [6] to a multidimensional form easier to accomplish. Then, we show (in Section 4.2 and Section 9) how to still simulate from π even when $P(T > S) = 0$. We do that in two different ways, one a sandwiching argument and the other involving Harris recurrent Markov chain regenerations.

4.1 Algorithm for simulating exactly from π for the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ queue: The case $P(T > S) > 0$

As mentioned earlier, we will assume that $P(T > S) > 0$, so that the stable ($\rho < c$) RA and FIFO $GI/GI/c$ Markov chains (7) and (1) will visit 0 infinitely often with certainty. We imagine that at time $n = -\infty$, we start both (7) and (1) empty. We construct the RA model forward in time, while using Lemma 3.2 for the service times for the FIFO model, so that Lemma 3.1 applies and we have it in the form of (3), for all $t_n \leq 0$ up to and including at time $t_0 = 0$, at which time both models are in stationarity. We might have to continue the construction of the RA model so that $\mathbf{W}_0$ (distributed as π) can be constructed (e.g., enough service times have been initiated by the RA model for using Lemmas 3.1, 3.2). Formally, one can theoretically justify the existence of such infinite from the past versions (that obey Lemma 3.1) – by use of Loynes' Lemma. Each model (when started empty) satisfies the monotonicity required to use Loynes' Lemma. In particular, noting that $Q_{RA}(t_n-) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{V}_n = \mathbf{0}$, we conclude that if at any time n it holds that $\mathbf{V}_n = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{0}$. By the Markov property, given that $\mathbf{V}_n = \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{W}_n$, the future is independent of the past for each model, or said differently, *the past is independent of the future*. This remains valid if n is replaced by a stopping time (strong Markov property).

1. Simulate $\{\{(R_n^{(r)}(i), V_{-n}^0(i)) : 0 \leq n \leq N\}, 1 \leq i \leq c\}$, where $N = \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathbf{V}_{-n}^0 = \mathbf{0}\}$. If $N = 0$ stop. Otherwise, having stored all data, reconstruct $\mathbf{V}_n^0$ forwards in time from $n = -N$ (initially empty) until $n = 0$, using the recursion (15). During this forward-time reconstruction, re-define S_j as the j-th service initiation used by the RA model (e.g., we are using Lemma 3.2 to gather service times in the proper order to feed to the FIFO model, which is why we do the re-construction). If at time $n = 0$ there have not yet been N service initiations, then continue simulating the RA model out in forward time until finally there is a N^{th} service initiation, and then stop. This will require, at most, simulating

out to $n = N^{(+)} = \min\{n \geq 0 : \mathbf{V}^0_{-n} = \mathbf{0}\}$. Take the vector $(S_{-N}, S_{-N+1}, \ldots, S_{-1})$ and reset $(S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{N-1}) = (S_{-N}, S_{-N+1}, \ldots, S_{-1})$. Also, store the interarrival times $(T_{-N}, T_{-N+1}, \ldots, T_{-1})$, and reset $(T_0, \ldots, T_{N-1}) = (T_{-N}, T_{-N+1}, \ldots, T_{-1})$.

2. If $N = 0$, then set $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and stop. Otherwise use (1) with $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, recursively forwards in time N time steps until obtaining $\mathbf{W}_N$, by using the N re-set service and interarrival times $(S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{N-1})$ and $(T_0, \ldots, T_{N-1})$. Reset $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{W}_N$ and stop.

3. Output $\mathbf{W}_0$

Detailed simulation steps are discussed in Appendix (Section 10).

4.2 A more efficient algorithm: sandwiching

In this section, we no longer even need to assume that $P(T > S) > 0$. (Another method allowing for $P(T > S) = 0$ involving Harris recurrent regeneration is given later in Section 9.) Instead of waiting for the workload vector of the $GI/GI/c$ queue under RA discipline to become $\mathbf{0}$ for the first time, we can choose some time $-\hat{T} < 0$ (this time is called "inspection time") to stop the backwards simulation of the process under RA, then construct an upper bound $GI/GI/c$ FIFO process (starting at time $-\hat{T}$ with workload vector being $\mathbf{V}^0(-\hat{T})$) and a lower bound $GI/GI/c$ FIFO process (starting at time $-\hat{T}$ from empty). We then evolve these two bounding processes using the same stream of arrivals and service time requirements.

We can choose the inspection time $-\hat{T}$ be the time spot of some arrival, such as the $-\kappa^{th}$ ($\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_+$) arrival time, i.e. $-\hat{T} = -\sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} T_{-j}$, then

$$\mathbf{V}^0(-\hat{T}) = \mathbf{V}^0_{-\kappa} = \max_{m \geq \kappa} \mathbf{R}^{(r)}_m - \mathbf{R}^{(r)}_\kappa.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}/\{0\}$, let t_n be the arrival time of n^{th} arrival, i.e.

$$t_n = \begin{cases} -\sum_{j=-1}^{n} T_j & \text{if } n < 0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n} T_j & \text{if } n > 0 \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(t)$ denote the ordered remaining workload vector of the original $GI/GI/c$ FIFO queueing process, start from the infinite past, evaluated at time t. And for $t \geq t_{-\kappa}$, we define $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t)$ to be the ordered remaining workload vectors of the upper bound and lower bound processes, initiated at the inspection time $t_{-\kappa}$, evaluated at time t. By our construction and Theorem 3.3 in [7],

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t_{-\kappa}) = \mathcal{R}\left(\mathbf{V}^0_{-\kappa}\right) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(t_{-\kappa}) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t_{-\kappa}) = \mathbf{0},$$

and for all $t > t_{-\kappa}$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(t) \geq \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t),$$

with all the above inequalities hold coordinate-wise.

Note that we can evolve the ordered remaining workload vectors as follows: for $-\kappa < n \leq -1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t_n) &= \mathcal{R}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t_{n-1}) + S_{n-1}\mathbf{f} - T_{n-1}\mathbf{e}\right)^+, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t_n) &= \mathcal{R}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t_{n-1}) + S_{n-1}\mathbf{f} - T_{n-1}\mathbf{e}\right)^+. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

And for $t_n \le t < t_{n+1} I\,(n < -1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa} &= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t_n) - (t - t_n)\mathbf{f}\right)^+, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa} &= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t_n) - (t - t_n)\mathbf{f}\right)^+. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Let $Q(t)$ be the number of customers in the original $GI/GI/c$ FIFO queue at time t, and let $Q^u_{-\kappa}(t)$ ($Q^l_{-\kappa}(t)$) be the number of customers in the upper (lower) bound queueing process, initiated at $t_{-\kappa}$, evaluated at time $t \ge t_{-\kappa}$. If at some time $t_{-\kappa} < \tau \le 0$, we observe that $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(\tau) = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(\tau)$, then it must be true that $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\tau) = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(\tau)$ and $Q^u_{-\kappa}(\tau) = Q^l_{-\kappa}(\tau) = Q(\tau)$ (because the ordered remaining workload vectors of two bounding processes can only meet when they both have idle servers). We call such time τ "coalescence time" and from then on we have full information of the target $GI/GI/c$ FIFO queue, therefore we can continue simulate it until time 0 from stationarity.

However if coalescence does not happen by time 0, then we can adopt the so-called "back-off" strategy by letting the arrival time $t_{-2\kappa}$ be our new inspection time and redo the above procedure to detect coalescence. Theorem 3.3 in [7] ensures that for any $t_{-\kappa} \le t \le 0$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t) \ge \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-2\kappa}(t) \ge \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(t) \ge \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-2\kappa}(t) \ge \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t).$$

We summarize the sandwiching algorithm as follows:

1. Simulate $\left\{\left(\mathbf{R}^{(r)}_n, \mathbf{V}^0_{-n}\right) : 0 \le n \le \kappa\right\}$ with all data stored.

2. Use the stored data to reconstruct $\mathbf{V}^0_n$ forward in time from $n = -\kappa$ until $n = 0$, using equation (15), and re-define S_j as the j^{th} service initiation used by the RA model.

3. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t_{-\kappa}) = \mathcal{R}\left(\mathbf{V}^0_{-\kappa}\right)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t_{-\kappa}) = \mathbf{0}$, then use the same stream of interarrival time $(T_{-\kappa}, T_{-\kappa+1}, \cdots, T_{-1})$ and service requirements $(S_{-\kappa}, S_{-\kappa+1}, \cdots, S_{-1})$ to simulate $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t)$ forwards in time using equations (18) and (19).

4. If at some $t \in [t_{-\kappa}, 0]$ we detect $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^l_{-\kappa}(t)$, set $\tau = t$, $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\tau) = \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^u_{-\kappa}(\tau)$, $Q(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^c I(\tilde{V}_i(\tau) > 0)$. Then use the remaining interarrival times and service durations to evolve the original $GI/GI/c$ FIFO queue from τ to 0, output $\left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(0), Q(0), -t_{-1}\right)$ and stop.

5. If no coalescence detected by time 0, set $\kappa \leftarrow 2\kappa$, then continue simulate the process until $-\kappa^{th}$ arrival, i.e. $\left\{\left(\mathbf{R}^{(r)}_n, \mathbf{V}^0_{-n}\right) : 0 \le n \le \kappa\right\}$ backwards with all data stored. Then go to Step 2.

Proposition 4.1 *The algorithm above has finite expected termination time.*

Proof : Same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3 in [5]. ■

4.3 Numerical Results

As a sanity check, we have implemented our perfect sampling algorithm in Matlab for the case of $M/M/c$ queues, for which the steady-state analysis can be performed in closed form.

Firstly we compared the theoretical distribution to the empirical distribution obtained from a large number of runs of our algorithm for different sets of parameter values, and they are all in close agreement. Figure 1 show the result of such test when $\lambda = 3$, $\mu = 2$, $c = 2$. Grey bars are the empirical results of 5,000 draws using our algorithm, and black bars are the theoretical distribution of number of customers in system. Figure 2 gives another result with a different set of parameteres.



Figure 1: Number of customers for an $M/M/c$ queue in stationarity when $\lambda = 3$, $\mu = 2$, $c = 2$.



Figure 2: Number of customers for an $M/M/c$ queue in stationarity when $\lambda = 10$, $\mu = 2$, $c = 10$.

Next we run a numerical experiment to compare how far we need to simulate the dominating process backwards to detect coalescence. For the first algorithm in section 4.1, we let running time $\hat{T} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} T_{-i}$, i.e. the time taken for the queue under RA discipline to empty; and for the second algorithm in section 4.2, we let running time $\hat{T} = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} T_{-i}$, i.e. the time taken for the first successful inspection time in order to detect coalescence before time 0. Figure 3 we give distributions of the time taken for the first time coalescence ever detected under two algorithms for an $M/M/c$ queue with parameters $\lambda = 10$, $\mu = 2$, $c = 10$, from 5000 runs. The result indicates that the second algorithm (sandwiching) performs significantly faster than the first one.



Figure 3: Distributions of time taken to detect coalescence under two algorithms for an $M/M/c$ queue

Finally we compare how computational complexity of our sandwiching algorithm compare to the algorithm given in [5]. Notice these two algorithms do look similar: they both use back-off strategies to run two bounding processes from some inspection time and check if they meet before time 0. The difference is that in [5] they use a so-called "vacation system" to construct

upper bound process, whereas we use the same queue but under RA discipline instead. In the following numerical experiment, we define the computational complexity as the total number of arrivals each algorithm samples backwards to detect coalescence. Table 1 shows how they vary with traffic intensity, $\rho = \lambda/c\mu$, based on 5000 independent runs of both algorithms for each ρ. The result suggests that our second algorithm (sandwiching) outperform the one proposed in [5] as the magnitude of our computational complexity does not increase as fast as theirs when traffic intensity increases.

Table 1: simulation result for computational complexities with varying traffic intensities
$M/M/c$ queue with fixed $\mu = 5$ and $c = 2$

λ	ρ	number of arrivals simulated backwards	
		Sandwiching Algorithm	Algorithm in [5]
5	0.5	55.9104 ± 0.5643	73.1764 ± 1.1928
6	0.6	86.8206 ± 1.0361	137.4774 ± 2.4954
7	0.7	149.1300 ± 2.1381	310.0812 ± 6.0624
8	0.8	322.0778 ± 6.1726	945.3602 ± 18.7566
9	0.9	1424.4714 ± 30.2792	5718.4338 ± 105.3457

5 Continuous-time stationary constructions

For a stable FIFO $GI/GI/1$ queue, let D denote stationary customer delay (time spent in queue (line)); e.g., it has the limiting distribution of $D_{n+1} = (D_n + S_n - T_n)^+$ as $n \to \infty$.

Independently, let S_e denote a random variable distributed as the equilibrium distribution G_e of service time distribution G, that is,

$$G_e(x) = \mu \int_0^x P(S > y)dy, \ x \geq 0, \tag{20}$$

where $S \sim G$. Let $V(t)$ denote total work in system at time t; the sum of all whole or remaining service times in the system at time t. $D_n = V(t_n-)$, and one can construct

$$V(t) = (D_n + S_n - (t - t_n))^+, \ t_n \leq t < t_n + 1.$$

(It is to be continuous from the right with left limits.) Let V denote stationary workload; e.g., it has the limiting distribution

$$P(V \leq x) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P(V(s) \leq x)ds, \ x \geq 0. \tag{21}$$

The following is well known to hold (see [15], for example):

$$P(V > x) = \rho P(D + Se > x), \ x \geq 0. \tag{22}$$

Letting $F_D(x) = P(D \leq x)$ denote the probability distribution of D, and δ_0 denote the point mass at 0, this means that the distribution of V can be written as a mixture

$$(1-\rho)\delta_0 + \rho F_D * Ge.$$

This leads to the following:

Proposition 5.1 *For a stable* $(0 < \rho < 1)$ *FIFO* $GI/GI/1$ *queue, if* ρ *is explicitly known, and one can exactly simulate from* D *and* G_e*, then one can exactly simulate from* V*.*

Proof :

1. Simulate a Bernoulli (ρ) rv B.
2. If $B = 0$, then set $V = 0$. Otherwise, if $B = 1$, then: simulate D and independently simulate a copy $S_e \sim G_e$. Set $V = D + S_e$. Stop

■

Another algorithm requiring instead the ability to simulate from A_e (equilibrium distribution of the interarrival-time distribution A) instead of G_e follows from another known relation:

$$V \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} (D + S - T_e)^+,$$

where D, S and $T_e \sim A_e$ are independent. Thus by simulating D, S, and T_e, simply set $V = (D + S - T_e)^+$. This idea extends to the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ model, where our objective is to exactly simulate from the time-stationary distribution of the continuous-time Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector, $\mathbf{W}(t) = (W(1,t), \ldots, W(c,t))^T,\ t \geq 0$, where it can be defined via

$$\mathbf{W}(t) = R(\mathbf{W}_n + S_n\mathbf{e} - (t - t_n)\mathbf{f})^+,\ t_n \leq t < t_{n+1}.$$

It is to be continuous from the right with left limits; $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{W}(t_n-)$. Total workload $V(t)$, for example, is obtained from this via

$$V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{c} W(i,t).$$

Letting $\mathbf{W}^*$ have the time-stationary distribution of $\mathbf{W}(t)$ as $t \to \infty$, and letting $\mathbf{W}_0$ have the discrete-time stationary distribution π and letting S, T_e and $\mathbf{W}_0$ be independent, then

$$\mathbf{W}^* \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} R(\mathbf{W}_0 + S\mathbf{e} - T_e\mathbf{f})^+.$$

So once we have a copy of $\mathbf{W}_0$ (distributed as π) from our algorithm from Section 4.1, we can easily construct a copy of $\mathbf{W}^*$ as long as we can simulate from A_e.

6 Applications of the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ algorithm to other service disciplines such as "Random Selection" or LIFO

Suppose that one wishes to sample exactly from the stationary delay D_{RS} for a *Random Selection (RS)* $GI/GI/c$ queue. In this model, the next customer to enter service from the queue (line) is chosen randomly: If there are $k \geq 1$ customers in line, then with probability $1/k$

any one of them will be chosen next. Let $Q_{RS}(t)$ denote the total number in system at time t for this model. The first important observation is that because of all the iid assumptions, the stochastic process $\{Q_{RS}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is identical in distribution to that of $\{Q_F(t) : t \geq 0\}$. In fact if service times are handed out by the server, for example, then the sample paths are identical. So let us assume that this is so. At time $t = 0$, we can obtain the FIFO stationary $\mathbf{W}_0$ (distributed as π), via Section 4.2, but we could also have (instead or together with) constructed $(Q_0, S_{0,1}, \ldots, S_{0,L_0})$ where Q_0 is stationary number in system as found by C_0 and $(S_{0,1}, \ldots, S_{0,L_0})$ are the (stationary) remaining service times of those (if any) in service, where L_0 denotes stationary number in service as found by C_0; $0 \leq L_0 \leq c$. If $Q_0 = 0$, then $L_0 = 0$ and we define $S_{0,0} = 0$. (This requires a more detailed *discrete-event simulation* with events as an "arrival" and a "service completion".)

Let us suppose we have done so. Then to obtain a copy of D_{RS}, we simply start the system off at time $t = 0$ with stationary $(Q_0, S_{0,1}, \ldots, S_{0,L_0})$, and tag C_0 (who arrives at time $t = 0$), by simulating the RS model forwards in time until C_0 enters service; that length of time is D_{RS}. If C_0 finds a server free (e.g., $Q_0 < c$), then of course $D_{RS} = 0$ and no further simulation is necessary. The same method will work for Last-in-First-Out (LIFO), by which we mean upon arrival a customer joins the front of the line (queue) but without pre-emption: The distribution of the total number in system process $\{Q_{LIFO}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is identical in distribution to that of $\{Q_F(t) : t \geq 0\}$, as is $(Q_0, S_{0,1}, \ldots, S_{0,L_0})$.

7 Why we can assume that interarrival times are bounded

Lemma 7.1 *Consider the recursion*

$$D_{n+1} = (D_n + S_n - T_n)^+, \ n \geq 0, \tag{23}$$

where both $\{T_n\}$ and $\{S_n\}$ are non-negative random variables, and $D_0 = 0$.

Suppose for another sequence of non-negative random variables $\{\hat{T}_n\}$, it holds that

$$P(\hat{T}_n \leq T_n, \ n \geq 0) = 1.$$

Then for the recursion

$$\hat{D}_{n+1} = (\hat{D}_n + S_n - \hat{T}_n)^+, \ n \geq 0, \tag{24}$$

with $\hat{D}_0 = 0$, it holds that

$$P(D_n \leq \hat{D}_n, \ n \geq 0) = 1. \tag{25}$$

Proof : The proof is by induction on $n \geq 0$: Because (w.p.1 in the following arguments) $\hat{T}_0 \leq T_0$, we have

$$D_1 = (S_0 - T_0)^+ \leq (S_0 - \hat{T}_0)^+ = \hat{D}_1.$$

Now suppose the result holds for some $n \geq 0$. Then $D_n \leq \hat{D}_n$ and by assumption $\hat{T}_n \leq T_n$; hence

$$D_{n+1} = (D_n + S_n - T_n)^+ \leq (\hat{D}_n + S_n - \hat{T}_n)^+ = \hat{D}_{n+1},$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Proposition 7.1 *Consider the stable RA $GI/GI/c$ model in which $P(T > S) > 0$. In order to use this model to simulate from the corresponding stationary distribution of the FIFO $GI/GI/c$ model as explained in the Section 4.1, without loss of generality we can assume that the interarrival times $\{T_n\}$ are bounded: There exists a $b > 0$ such that*

$$P(T_n \leq b, \ n \geq 0) = 1.$$

Proof : By stability, $cE(T) > E(S)$, and by assumption $P(T > S) > 0$. If the $\{T_n\}$ are not bounded, then for $b > 0$, define $\hat{T}_n = \min\{T_n, b\},\ n \geq 0$; truncated T_n. Choose b sufficiently large so that $cE(\hat{T}) > E(S)$ and $P(\hat{T} > S) > 0$ still holds. Now use the $\{\hat{T}_n\}$ in place of the $\{T_n\}$ to construct an RA model, denoted by $\widehat{RA}$. Denote this by

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}}_n = (\hat{V}_n(1), \ldots, \hat{V}_n(c)),$$

where it satisfies the recursion (7) in the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{n+1} = (\hat{\mathbf{V}}_n + \mathbf{S}_n - \hat{\mathbf{T}}_n)^+,\ n \geq 0.$$

From Lemma 7.1, it holds (coordinate-wise) that

$$\mathbf{V}_n \leq \hat{\mathbf{V}}_n,\ n \geq 0,$$

and thus, if for some $n \geq 0$ it holds that $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_n = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{V}_n = \mathbf{0}$ and hence $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{0}$ (as explained in our previous Section). Since b was chosen ensuring that $cE(\hat{T}) > E(S)$ and $P(\hat{T} > S) > 0$, $\{\hat{\mathbf{V}}_n\}$ is a stable RA $GI/GI/c$ queue that will indeed empty infinitely often. Thus we can use it to do the backwards in discrete-time stationary construction until it empties, at time (say) $-\hat{N}$; $\hat{N} = \min\{n \geq 0 : \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{-n} = 0\}$. Then, we can re-construct the original RA model (starting empty at time $-\hat{N}$) using the (original untruncated) $\hat{N}$ interarrival times $(T_{-\hat{N}}, T_{-\hat{N}+1}, ..., T_{-1})$ in liu of $(\hat{T}_{-\hat{N}}, \hat{T}_{-\hat{N}+1}, ..., \hat{T}_{-1})$, so as to collect $\hat{N}$ re-ordered S_n needed in construction of $\mathbf{W}_0$ for the FIFO model. ■

Remark 7.1 One would expect that the reconstruction of the original RA model in the above proof is unnecessary, that instead we only need to re-construct the $\widehat{RA}$ model until we have $\hat{N}$ service initiations from it, as opposed to $\hat{N}$ service initiations from the original RA model. Although this might be true, the subtle problem is that the order in which service times are initiated in the $\widehat{RA}$ model will typically be different than for the original RA model; they have different arrival processes (counterexamples are easy to construct). Thus it is not clear how one can utilize Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 and so on. One would need to generalize Lemma 3.1 to account for truncated arrival times used in the RA model, but not the FIFO model, in perhaps a form such as a variation of Equation (3),

$$P(Q_F(t_n-) \leq Q_{\widehat{RA}}(\hat{t}_n-),\ \text{for all } n \geq 0) = 1, \tag{26}$$

where $\{\hat{t}_n\}$ is the truncated renewal process. We did not explore this further.

8 Fork-Join Models

The RA recursion (7),

$$\mathbf{V}_{n+1} = (\mathbf{V}_n + \mathbf{S}_n - \mathbf{T}_n)^+,\ n \geq 0, \tag{27}$$

is actually a special case for the modeling of *Fork-Join* (FJ) queues (also called *Split and Match*) with c nodes. In an FJ model, each arrival is a "job" with c components, the i^{th} component requiring service at the i^{th} FIFO queue. So upon arrival at time t_n, the job splits into its c components to be served. As soon as all c components have completed service, then and only then, does the job depart. Such models are useful in manufacturing applications. The n^{th} job (C_n) thus arrives with a service time vector attached of the form $\mathbf{S}_n = (\mathbf{S}_n(1), ..., \mathbf{S}_n(c))$. Let us

assume that the vectors are iid, but otherwise can be generally jointly distributed; for then (27) still forms a Markov chain. We will denote this model as the GI/GI FJ model. The sojourn time of the i^{th} component is given by $V_n(i) + S_n(i)$, and thus the sojourn time of the n^{th} job, C_n, is given by

$$H_n = \max_{1 \le i \le c} \{V_n(i) + S_n(i)\}. \tag{28}$$

Of great interest is obtaining the limiting distribution of H_n as $n \to \infty$; we denote a rv with this distribution as H^0. FJ models are notoriously difficult to analyze analytically: Even the special case of Poisson arrivals and iid independent exponential service times is non-trivial because of the dependency of the c queues through the common arrival process. (A classic paper is Flatto [9]). In fact when $c \ge 3$, only bounds and approximations are available. As for exact simulation, there is a paper by Hongsheng Dai[8], in which Poisson arrivals and independent exponential service times are assumed. Because of the continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) model structure, the author is able to construct (simulate) the time-reversed CTMC to use in a coupling from the past algorithm.

Our simulation method for the RA model outlined in Section 4, however (modified to accommodate generally jointly distributed service time vectors under suitable conditions), yields an exact copy of H^0 for the general GI/GI FJ model via first exactly simulating $\mathbf{V}_0^0$ then simulating, independently, a vector of service times $\mathbf{S} = (S(1), ..., S(c))$ and setting

$$H^0 = \max_{1 \le i \le c} \{V_0^0(i) + S(i)\}.$$

Even when the service time components within $\mathbf{S}$ are independent, or the case when service time distributions are assumed to have a finite moment generating function (in a neighborhood of the origin), such results are new and non-trivial.

9 The case when $P(T > S) = 0$: Harris recurrent regeneration

For a stable FIFO $GI/GI/c$ queue, the stability condition can be re-written as $E(T_1 + \cdots + T_c) > E(S)$, which implies also that $P(T_1 + \cdots + T_c > S) > 0$. Thus assuming that $P(T > S) > 0$ is not necessary for stability. When $P(T > S) = 0$, the system will never empty again after starting, and so using consecutive visits to 0 as regeneration points is not possible. But the system does regenerate in a more general way via the use of Harris recurrent Markov chain theory; see [16] for details and history of this approach. The main idea is that while the system will not empty infinitely often, the number in system process $\{Q_F(t_n-) : n \ge 0\}$ will visit an integer $1 \le j \le c-1$ infinitely often.

For illustration here, let us consider $c = 2$ servers and let assume that $1 < \rho < 2$. (Note that if $\rho < 1$, then equivalently $E(T) > E(S)$ and so $P(T > S) > 0$; that is why we rule out $\rho < 1$ here.) We now assume that $P(T > S) = 0$. This implies that for $\underline{s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{s > 0 : P(S > s) > 0\}$ and $\overline{t} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{t > 0 : P(T > t) > 0\}$, we must have $0 < \overline{t} < \underline{s} < \infty$. It is shown in [16] that for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the following event will happen infinitely often (in n) with probability 1

$$\{Q_{RA}(t_n-) = 1,\ V_n(1) = 0,\ V_n(2) \le \epsilon,\ T_n > \epsilon,\ U_n = 1\}. \tag{29}$$

If n is such a time, then at time $n+1$, we have

$$\{Q_{RA}(t_{n+1}-) = 1,\ V_{n+1}(2) = 0,\ V_{n+1}(1) = (S_n - T_n) \mid T_n > \epsilon\}. \tag{30}$$

The point is that C_n finds one server (server 1) empty, and the other queue with only one customer in it, and that customer is in service with a remaining service time $\leq \epsilon$. C_n then enters service at node 1 with service time S_n; but since $T_n > \epsilon$, C_{n+1} arrives finding the second queue empty, and the first server has remaining service time $S_n - T_n$ conditional on $T_n > \epsilon$. Under the coupling of Lemma 3.1, the same will be so for the FIFO model (see Remark 9.1 below): At such a time n,

$$\{Q_F(t_n-) = 1,\ W_n(1) = 0,\ W_n(2) \leq \epsilon,\ T_n > \epsilon\} \tag{31}$$

and at time $n+1$ we have

$$\{Q_F(t_{n+1}-) = 1,\ W_n(1) = 0,\ W_n(2) = (S_n - T_n) \mid T_n > \epsilon\}. \tag{32}$$

(30) and (32) define positive recurrent regeneration points for the two models (at time $n+1$); the consecutive times at which regenerations occur forms a (discrete-time) positive recurrent renewal process.

To put this to use, we change the stopping time N given in (17) to:

$$\begin{aligned} N+1 \quad = \quad & \min\{n \geq 1 : Q^0_{RA}(t_{-(n+1)}-) = 1,\ V^0_{-(n+1)}(1) = 0, && (33)\\ & V^0_{-(n+1)}(2) \leq \epsilon,\ T_{-(n+1)} > \epsilon,\ U_{-(n+1)} = 1\}. && (34) \end{aligned}$$

Then we do our reconstructions for the algorithm in Section 4.1 by starting at time $-N$, with both models starting with the same starting value

$$\{Q_{RA}(t_{-N}-) = 1,\ V^0_{-N}(2) = 0,\ V^0_{-N}(1) = (S_{-(N+1)} - T_{-(N+1)}) \mid T_{-(N+1)} > \epsilon\} \tag{35}$$

$$\{Q_F(t_{-N}-) = 1,\ W_{-N}(1) = 0,\ W_{-N}(2) = (S_{-(N+1)} - T_{-(N+1)}) \mid T_{-(N+1)} > \epsilon\}. \tag{36}$$

Remark 9.1 The service time used in (35) and (36) for coupling via Lemma 3.2, $S_{-(N+1)}$, is in fact identical for both systems because (subtle): At time $-(N+1)$, both systems have only one customer in system, and thus total work is in fact equal to the remaining service time; so we use Equation (5) to conclude that both remaining service times (even if different) are $\leq \epsilon$ (e.g., that is why (31) follow from (29)). Meanwhile, $C_{-(N+1)}$ enters service immediately across both systems, so it is indeed the same service time $S_{-(N+1)}$ used for both for this initiation.

10 Appendix

Now we describe the simulation algorithm in section 4.1 in detail. First let us define the maximum of a sequence of vectors. Suppose we have $(\mathbf{X}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{X}_n)$, where $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, we let

$$\max(\mathbf{X}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{X}_n) = \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} X_k(1), \cdots, \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} X_k(d) \right)^T.$$

For $-\infty < n < \infty$, we let

$$\mathbf{U}_n = (I\{U_n = 1\}, \cdots, I\{U_n = c\})^T,$$

$$\mathbf{\Delta}_n = S_n\mathbf{U}_n - \mathbf{T}_n = (\Delta_n(1), \cdots, \Delta_n(c))^T.$$

Our goal is to simulate the first stopping time $N \geq 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{V}_{-N}^0 = \max_{m\geq N} \mathbf{R}_m^{(r)} - \mathbf{R}_N^{(r)} = \max_{m\geq N} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbf{\Delta}_{-j} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbf{\Delta}_{-j} = \mathbf{0},$$

jointly with $\left\{\left(\mathbf{R}_n^{(r)}, \mathbf{V}_{-n}^0\right) : 0 \leq n \leq N\right\}$.

Because of the stability condition $\lambda < c\mu$, we can find some $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $1/\mu < a < c/\lambda$ and $\mathbb{P}(T > a) > 0$, then for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{m\geq n} \mathbf{R}_m^{(r)} &= \max_{m\geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbf{\Delta}_{-j} = \max_{m\geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (S_{-j}\mathbf{U}_{-j} - \mathbf{T}_{-j}) \\
&= \max_{m\geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} ((S_{-j}\mathbf{U}_{-j} - a\mathbf{U}_{-j}) + (a\mathbf{U}_{-j} - \mathbf{T}_{-j})) \\
&\leq \max_{m\geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} ((S_{-j} - a)\,\mathbf{U}_{-j}) + \max_{m\geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (a\mathbf{U}_{-j} - \mathbf{T}_{-j})
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\mathbf{X}_{-m} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (S_{-j} - a)\,\mathbf{U}_{-j}$ for all $m \geq 1$ with $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and letting $\mathbf{Y}_{-m} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (a\mathbf{U}_{-j} - \mathbf{T}_{-j})$ for all $m \geq 1$ with $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, we define

$$n^* = \inf\{n \geq 0 : \max_{m\geq n} \mathbf{X}_{-m} = \mathbf{X}_{-n},\ \max_{m\geq n} \mathbf{Y}_{-m} = \mathbf{Y}_{-n}\}, \tag{37}$$

then by the inequality derived above, we get $\max_{m\geq n^*} \mathbf{R}_m^{(r)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(r)}$, hence $\mathbf{V}_{-n^*}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ and we can let the stopping time $N \leftarrow n^*$.

10.1 Simulation Algorithm for $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ and running time maximums

We first consider simulating the multi-dimensional random walk $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ with $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Since for all $j \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E}[a\mathbf{U}_{-j} - \mathbf{T}_{-j}] < \mathbf{0}$ and $aU_{-j}(i) - T_{-j} < a$ for all $1 \leq i \leq c$, we can simulate the running time maximum $\max_{m\geq n} \mathbf{Y}_{-m}$ jointly with the path $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ via exponential change of measure method developed in [4] with the following assumptions.

Assumption 1: Suppose that in every dimension $1 \leq i \leq c$ (since they are marginally distributed identical), there exists $\theta^* \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\phi_i(\theta^*) = \log \mathbb{E}_0 \exp(\theta^* (aU_{-j}(i) - T_{-j})) = 0.$$

Assumption 2: We can choose a constant $m \geq 0$ large enough such that

$$m > \frac{\ln(c)}{\theta^*}. \tag{38}$$

Given a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^c$, define

$$T_{\mathbf{b}} = \inf\{n \geq 0 : Y_{-n}(i) > b(i), \quad \text{for some } i\}, \tag{39}$$

$$T_{-\mathbf{b}} = \inf\{n \geq 0 : Y_{-n}(i) < -b(i), \quad \text{for all } i\}. \tag{40}$$

Next we define a sequence of upward and downward "milestones" for this multi-dimensional random walk. Set $D_0 = 0$ and $\Gamma_0 = \infty$. For $k \geq 1$, let

$$D_k = \inf\{n \geq D_{k-1} \vee \Gamma_{k-1} I\left(\Gamma_{k-1} < \infty\right) : Y_{-n}(i) < Y_{-D_{k-1}}(i) - m, \text{ for all } i\}, \tag{41}$$

$$\Gamma_k = \inf\{n \geq D_k : Y_{-n}(i) > Y_{-D_k}(i) + m, \text{ for some } i\}. \tag{42}$$

Note that by convention, $\Gamma_k I\left(\Gamma_k < \infty\right) = 0$ if $\Gamma_k = \infty$ for any $k \geq 0$. We let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^c$, which is initially set to be $\infty \cdot \mathbf{1}$, to be the upper bound of $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ process. From the construction of "milestones" in (41) and (42), we can see that if for some $k \geq 1$ that $\Gamma_k = \infty$, it means after D_k the process will never cross over the level $\mathbf{Y}_{-D_k} + m \cdot \mathbf{1}$, component by component. (i.e. for $n \geq D_k$, $Y_{-n}(i) \leq Y_{-D_k}(i) + m$ for all $1 \leq i \leq c$.) Therefore if $\Gamma_k = \infty$ for some $k \geq 1$, we can update the upper bound vector $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_{-D_k} + m \cdot \mathbf{1}$.

10.1.1 Global maximum of $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$

Define

$$\Delta = \inf\{D_k : \Gamma_k = \infty, k \geq 1\}. \tag{43}$$

By construction of "milestone events", it is clear that for $n \geq \Delta$, $Y_{-n}(i) \leq Y_{-\Delta}(i) + m$ for all $1 \leq i \leq c$. Then we can evaluate the global maximum of the process $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ to be

$$\mathbf{M}_0 := \max_{k \geq 0} \mathbf{Y}_k = \max_{0 \leq k \leq \Delta} \mathbf{Y}_k. \tag{44}$$

Algorithm 1: Simulate Global Maximum

1. Set $n = 0$, $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{D} = [0]$, $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\infty]$, $\mathbf{Level} = \mathbf{0}$.
2. Generate $U \sim unif\{1, \cdots, c\}$ and independently sample $T \sim A$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_{-(n+1)} = \mathbf{Y}_{-n} + a \cdot \mathbf{U} - \mathbf{T}$, where $\mathbf{U} = (I\{U = 1\}, \cdots, I\{U = c\})^T$, $\mathbf{T} = (T, \cdots, T)^T$. Set $n \leftarrow n + 1$, $U_{-n} \leftarrow U$ and $T_{-n} \leftarrow T$.
3. If there is some $i \in \{1, \cdots, c\}$ with $Y_{-n}(i) \geq Level(i) - m$, then go to Step 2; otherwise set $\mathbf{D} \leftarrow [\mathbf{D}, n]$, $\mathbf{Level} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_{-n}$.
4. Sample $J \sim Ber\left(P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty\right)\right)$.
5. If $J = 1$, simulate a new conditional path $\{(\mathbf{y}_{-k}, u_{-k}, t_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}\}$ with $\mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, following the conditional distribution of $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}\}$ given that $T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_{-n} + \mathbf{y}_{-k}$, $U_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow u_{-k}$, $T_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow t_{-k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}$. Set $n \leftarrow n + k$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\mathbf{\Gamma}, n]$. Go to Step 2.
6. If $J = 0$, set $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\mathbf{\Gamma}, \infty]$ and output $\Delta \leftarrow n$, $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq \Delta\}$, $\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and global maximum $\mathbf{M}_0 \leftarrow \max_{0 \leq k \leq \Delta} \mathbf{Y}_{-k}$.

Next we explain how to execute Step 4, 5 and 6 in previous algorithm. The procedure is similar to the multi-dimensional procedure given in [4], so here we describe briefly.

Let $P_0(\cdot)$ denote the canonical probability, and let $P_0^*(\cdot) = P_0(\cdot | T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty)$. Now our goal is to simulate from the conditional law of $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}\}$ given that $T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty$ and $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. simulate from P_0^*. The proposal distribution we will use for here is denoted as $P_0'(\cdot)$. A typical element ω' sampled under $P_0'(\cdot)$ is of the form $\omega' = ((\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : k \geq 0), Index)$, where $Index \in \{1, \cdots, c\}$ and it indicates the direction we pick to do exponential tilting. The distribution of ω' induced by $P_0'(\cdot)$ is, first

$$P_0'\left(Index = i\right) = w_i := \frac{1}{c}. \tag{45}$$

Then conditioning on $Index = i$, for every set $A \in \sigma\left(\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq n\right)$,

$$P_0'\left(A | Index = i\right) = \mathbb{E}_0\left[\exp\left(\theta^* Y_{-n}(i)\right) I_A\right].$$

In our case, given $Index = i$, under $P_0'(\cdot)$ we have

$$P_0'(U = j | Index = i) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(\theta^* a)}{\exp(\theta^* a)+c-1} & \text{if } j = i \\ \frac{1}{\exp(\theta^* a)+c-1} & \text{if } j \neq i \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

and the distribution of T is obtained by exponential tilting such that

$$\frac{dP_0'}{dP_0}(T) = \frac{\theta^* a + c - 1}{c} \exp\left(-\theta^* T\right) \tag{47}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0'\left[Y_{-n}(Index)\right] &= \sum_{i=1}^{c} \mathbb{E}_0\left[Y_{-n}(i) \exp\left(\theta^* Y_{-n}(i)\right)\right] P'\left(Index = i\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{c} \frac{d\phi_i\left(\theta^*\right)}{d\theta} w_i > 0 \end{aligned}$$

So we have $Y_{-n}\left(Index\right) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ almost surely under $P_0'\left(\cdot\right)$, thus $T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty$ with probability one under P_0'.

Then we show that this is a valid acceptance / rejection method.

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{dP_0^*}{dP_0'}\left(\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}\right) \\ =&\frac{1}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty\right)} \times \frac{dP_0}{dP_0'}\left(\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}\right) \\ =&\frac{1}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty\right)} \times \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{c} w_i \exp\left(\theta^* Y_{-T_{\mathbf{m}}}(i)\right)} \\ \leq&\frac{1}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty\right)} \times \frac{c}{\exp\left(\theta^* m\right)} \\ <&\frac{1}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{m}} < \infty\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality is guaranteed by (38) in Assumption 2.

We use the acceptance/rejection method to replace Step 4, 5 and 6 in **Algorithm 1** as follows:

4. Sample $\{(\mathbf{y}_{-k}, u_{-k}, t_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}})\}$ from $P_0'\left(\cdot\right)$ as indicated via equations (45), (46), (47). Then simulate a Bernoulli J with success probability

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{c} w_i \exp\left(\theta^* Y_{-T_{\mathbf{m}}}(i)\right)}.$$

5. If $J = 1$, set $\mathbf{Y}_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_{-n} + \mathbf{y}_{-k}$, $U_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow u_{-k}$, $T_{-(n+k)} \leftarrow t_{-k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq T_{\mathbf{m}}$. And set $n \leftarrow n + k$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\mathbf{\Gamma}, n]$. Go to Step 2.

6. If $J = 0$, set $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\mathbf{\Gamma}, \infty]$ and output $\Delta \leftarrow n$, $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq \Delta\}$, $\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and global maximum $\mathbf{M}_0 \leftarrow \max_{0 \leq k \leq \Delta} \mathbf{Y}_{-k}$.

10.1.2 Simulate Multi-dimensional Random Walk $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ with "milestones"

Define

$$\tau = \mathcal{R}\left(\left\{n \geq 0 : \max_{k \geq n} \mathbf{Y}_{-k} = \mathbf{Y}_{-n}\right\}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ is a sorting operator that sorts the integers in the target vector ascendingly.

For any $n \geq 0$, let

$$d_1(n) = \inf\{D_j : D_j \geq n, j \geq 0\},$$
$$d_2(n) = \inf\{D_k : D_k > d_1(n), \Gamma_k = \infty, k \geq 0\}.$$

If $n \in \tau$, it must be true that for any $n \leq k \leq d_2(n)$, $\mathbf{Y}_{-k} \leq \mathbf{Y}_{-n}$ coordinate-wise. Next we give the algorithm to sequentially simulate the multi-dimensional random walk along with "milestones" and a partial set of τ.

Lemma 10.1 *Let $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b} \leq \infty \cdot \mathbf{1}$ (coordinate-wise) and consider any sequence of bounded positive measurable functions $f_k : \mathbb{R}_{c\times(k+1)} \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_0\left[f_{T_{-\mathbf{a}}}\left(\mathbf{Y}_0, \cdots, \mathbf{Y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{a}}}\right) | T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right] \\
=&\frac{\mathbb{E}_0\left[f_{T_{-\mathbf{a}}}\left(\mathbf{Y}_0, \cdots, \mathbf{Y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{a}}}\right) I\left\{Y_{-j}(i) \leq b(i), \forall j < T_{-\mathbf{a}}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq c\right\} P_{\mathbf{Y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{a}}}}\left(T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right)\right]}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

So if $P_0^{**}(\cdot) = P(\cdot | T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty)$, then

$$\frac{dP_0^{**}}{dP_0} = \frac{I\left\{Y_{-j}(i) \leq b(i), \forall j < T_{-\mathbf{a}}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq c\right\} P_{\mathbf{Y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{a}}}}\left(T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right)}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right)} \leq \frac{1}{P_0\left(T_{\mathbf{b}} = \infty\right)}. \tag{48}$$

Lemma 10.1 enables us to sample a downward patch by using the acceptance/rejection method with the nominal distribution as proposal. Suppose our current position is $\mathbf{Y}_{-D_j}$ and we know that the process will never go above the upper bound $\mathbf{C}$ (coordinate-wise). Next we simulate the path up to time D_{j+1}. If we can propose a downward patch $\left(\mathbf{y}_{-1}, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{m}}}\right) := \left(\mathbf{Y}_{-1}, \cdots, \mathbf{Y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{m}}}\right)$, under the unconditional probability given $\mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{-k} \leq \mathbf{m}$ for $k \leq T_{-\mathbf{m}}$, then we accept the downward patch with probability $P_0\left(T_\sigma = \infty\right)$, where $\sigma = \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{Y}_{-D_j} - \mathbf{y}_{-T_{-\mathbf{m}}}$. A more efficient way to sample would be to sequentially generate $(\mathbf{y}_{-1}, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_{-\Delta})$ as long as $\mathbf{M}_0 \leq \mathbf{m}$ coordinate-wise. We give the efficient implementation in the next algorithm.

Algorithm 2: Sample partial set τ jointly with the process $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ until $f(\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq n\}, \tau) \geq K$, given previously sampled set τ, previously sampled process $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-j}, U_{-j}, T_{-j}) : 0 \leq j \leq l\}$ and previous partial sequences $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$

(If $l = 0$, initialize $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{D} = [0]$, $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\infty]$, $\tau = []$.)

1. Set $n = l$. If $n = 0$, call Algorithm 1 to get $n \leftarrow \Delta$, $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq \Delta\}$, $\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$.

2. If $f\left(\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq n\}, \tau\right) \geq K$, stop and output $\{(\mathbf{Y}_{-k}, U_{-k}, T_{-k}) : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ with updated $\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, τ. Otherwise go to Step 3.

3. Call Algorithm 1 to get $\tilde{\Delta}$, $\left\{\left(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{-j}, \tilde{U}_{-j}, \tilde{T}_{-j}\right) : 0 \leq j \leq \tilde{\Delta}\right\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_0$.

4. If $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_0 \leq \mathbf{m}$ coordinate-wise, then accept the sub-path and set

   (a) $\mathbf{Y}_{-(n+j)} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y}_{-n} + \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{-j}$, $U_{-(n+j)} \leftarrow U_{-n} + \tilde{U}_{-j}$, $T_{-(n+j)} \leftarrow T_{-n} + \tilde{T}_{-j}$ for $0 \leq j \leq \tilde{\Delta}$

   (b) Set $\mathbf{D} \leftarrow [\mathbf{D}, n + \tilde{\mathbf{D}}]$, $\mathbf{\Gamma} \leftarrow [\mathbf{\Gamma}, n + \tilde{\mathbf{\Gamma}}]$, $n \leftarrow n + \tilde{\Delta}$

   (c) Update $\tau \leftarrow [\tau, \mathcal{R}(\{k \in (\tau(end)+1, \mathbf{D}(end-1)) : \max_{k \leq j \leq n} \mathbf{Y}_{-j} = \mathbf{Y}_{-k}\})]$

   Go to Step 2.

5. Else go to Step 3.

10.2 Simulation Algorithm for $\{\mathbf{X}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ and running time maximums

As we sample the process $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$, we get the sequence $\{U_{-k} : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ along with it. Conditioning on that information, we can separate the multi-dimension process $\{\mathbf{X}_{-k} : k \geq 0\}$ to be c independent processes $\{X_{-k}(i) : k \geq 0\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \cdots, c\}$.

For each $1 \leq i \leq c$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $a < b$, define

$$N_i^{(r)}(a, b) = \sum_{j=a}^{b} I\{U_{-j} = i\} \tag{49}$$

to denotes the total number of times that a customer is routed to server i from the $(-a)^{th}$ arrival time spot to the $(-b)^{th}$ arrival time spot backwards in time. Hence

$$\max_{k \geq n} X_{-k}(i) = \max_{k \geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{k} (S_{-j} - a) I\{U_{-j} = i\} = \max_{k \geq n} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i^{(r)}(n,k)} \left(\tilde{S}_{-j}^{(i)} - a\right), \tag{50}$$

where $\tilde{S}_{-j}^{(i)}$ is the j-th service time assigned to server i counting backwards, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_{-j}^{(i)} &= S_{-R_i(j)}, \\ R_i(j) &= \inf\{n : N_i^{(r)}(1, n) = j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n^{(i)}} \left(\tilde{S}_{-j}^{(i)} - a\right)$ for $n^{(i)} \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq c$. Note $n^{(i)}$'s are the auxiliary indices for the i-th component process of $\{\mathbf{X}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$, and the correspondence between $n^{(i)}$ and the real indices of the multi-dimensional process is

$$n^{(i)} \longleftrightarrow \left\{R_i(n^{(i)}), R_i(n^{(i)}) + 1, \cdots, R_i(n^{(i)} + 1) - 1\right\} \tag{51}$$

Next we adopt the algorithm developed in [6] by choosing $m' > 0$ and $L' \geq 1$ properly and define the sequences of upward and downward "milestones" by letting $D_0^{(i)} = 0$, $\Gamma_0^{(i)} = \infty$, and for $j \geq 1$

$$D_j^{(i)} = \inf\left\{n^{(i)} \geq \Gamma_{j-1}^{(i)} I\left\{\Gamma_{j-1}^{(i)} < \infty\right\} \vee D_{j-1}^{(i)} : X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)} < X_{-D_{j-1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} - L'm'\right\}, \tag{52}$$

$$\Gamma_j^{(i)} = \inf\left\{n^{(i)} \geq D_j^{(i)} : X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)} - X_{-D_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} > m'\right\}. \tag{53}$$

with the convention that if $\Gamma_j^{(i)}$, then $\Gamma_j^{(i)} I\left\{\Gamma_j^{(i)} < \infty\right\} = 0$ for any $j \geq 0$.

Define

$$\tau_i = \mathcal{R}\left(\left\{n^{(i)} \geq 0 : \max_{k \geq n^{(i)}} X_{-k}^{(i)} = X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)}\right\}\right), \tag{54}$$

and for any $n^{(i)} \geq 0$, let

$$d_1^{(i)}(n^{(i)}) = \inf\{D_j^{(i)} : D_j^{(i)} \geq n^{(i)}, j \geq 0\},$$
$$d_2^{(i)}(n^{(i)}) = \inf\{D_j^{(i)} : D_j^{(i)} > d_1^{(i)}(n^{(i)}), \Gamma_j^{(i)} = \infty, j \geq 0\}.$$

If some $n^{(i)} \in \tau_i$, then for any $n^{(i)} \leq k \leq d_2^{(i)}(n^{(i)})$, $X_{-k}^{(i)} \leq X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)}$.

Algorithm 3: Sample partial set τ_i jointly with the process $\{X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)} : 0 \leq n^{(i)} \leq l\}$ until $g\left(\{X_{-n^{(i)}}^{(i)} : 0 \leq n^{(i)} \leq l\}, \tau_i\right) \geq K'$, given previously sampled partial process and partial sequences of milestones.

(Simulation steps are the same as Algorithm 3 in [6]. Construction of set τ_i is the same as in our Algorithm 2 discussed before.)

10.3 Simulation Algorithm for $\{\mathbf{R}_n^{(r)} : n \geq 0\}$ and coalescence detection

Now we put the algorithms of two parts together and come up with the method to exactly simulate the multi-dimensional random walk of interest.

Algorithm 4: Sample coalescence time N jointly with $\{\mathbf{X}_{-n} : n \geq 0\}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_n : n \geq 0\}$.

1. Initialize $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, $\tau = []$; for all $1 \leq i \leq c$, $X_{0^{(i)}}^{(i)} = 0$, $\tau_i = []$, $n_i = 0$.

2. For $1 \leq i \leq c$, call Algorithm 3 with

$$g = I\{||\tau_i|| > n_i\}, \quad K' = 1$$

to get updated partial path $\{X_{-j}^{(i)} : 0 \leq j \leq l^{(i)}\}$ and partial set τ_i. Set $n_i \leftarrow ||\tau_i||$.

3. Call Algorithm 2 with

$$f = \prod_{i=1}^{c} I\left(\sum_{j=1}^{l} I(U_{-j} = i) > n_i\right), \quad K = 1$$

to get updated partial path $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-j} : 0 \leq j \leq l\}$ and partial set τ.

4. For $1 \leq i \leq c$, set $Id_i = \cup_{k=1}^{n_i}\{R_i(\tau_i(k)), \cdots, R_i(\tau_i(k)+1) - 1\}$. If $\cap_{i=1}^{c} Id_i \cap \tau = \emptyset$, go to step 2; otherwise set

$$N \leftarrow \min\left(\cap_{i=1}^{c} Id_i \cap \tau\right)$$

and stop.

References

[1] S. Asmussen (2003). *Applied Probability and Queues* (2nd Ed.). Springer-Verlag, New York.

[2] S. Asmussen, P. W. Glynn (2007). *Stochastic Simulation*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[3] S. Asmussen, P. W. Glynn, & H. Thorisson (1992). Stationary detection in the initial transient problem. *ACM TOMACS*, **2**, 130-157.

[4] J. Blanchet and X. Chen (2015). Steady-state simulation of reflected Brownian motion and related stochastic networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **25**, 3209–3250.

[5] J. Blanchet, J. Dong and Y. Pei (2015). Perfect sampling of $GI/GI/c$ queues.

[6] J. Blanchet and A. Wallwater (2015). Exact sampling of stationary and time-reversed queues. *ACM TOMACS*, **25**, 26.

[7] S. B. Connor and W. S. Kendall (2015). Perfect simulation of M/G/c queues. *Advances in Applied Probability*, **47**, 4.

[8] Hongcheng Dai (2011). Exact Monte Carlo simulation for fork-join networks. *Advances in Applied Prob.*, **43**, 484-503.

[9] Flatto, L., and Hahn, S. (1984). Two parallel queues created by arrivals with two demands. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **44**, 1041-1053.

[10] S. G. Foss (1980). Approximation of mutichannel queueing systems. *Siberian Math. J.*, **21**, 132-40.

[11] S. G. Foss and N. I. Chernova (2001). On optimality of the FCFS discipline in mutiserver queueing systems and networks. *Siberian Math. J.*, **42**, 372-385.

[12] J. G. Propp and D.G. Wilson (1996) Exact sampling with coupled Markov chains and applications to statistical mechanics. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, **9**, 223-253.

[13] K. Sigman (2011). Exact simulation of the stationary distribution of the FIFO M/G/c queue. *Journal of Applied Probability.* **Special Volume 48A: New Frontiers in Applied Probability**, 209-216.

[14] K. Sigman (2011). Exact simulation of the stationary distribution of the FIFO M/G/c queue: The general case of $\rho < c$. *Queueing Systems.* **70**, 37-43.

[15] K. Sigman (1995). *Stationary Marked Point Processes: An Intuitive Approach*, Chapman and Hall, New York.

[16] K. Sigman (1988). Regeneration in Tandem Queues with Multi-Server Stations. *Journal of Applied Probability*, **25**, 391-403.

[17] R.W. Wolff (1987). Upper bounds on work in system for multi-channel queues. *J. Appl. Probab.* **14**, 547-551.

[18] R.W. Wolff (1982). Poisson Arrivals See Time Averages. *Operations Research.* **30**, 223-231.